



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

verbal inspiration was rather a shaping, formative, selective influence, operating in the life of Israel, often in intimate connection with conceptions and practices and modes of expression which Israel shared with peoples round about her. Is the same view to be extended to the New Testament, even to the teachings of Jesus? These recent studies give clearest proof of at least this fact, that much of the phraseology of the New Testament, even on important subjects, was current coin. Is not the New Testament exegete then compelled to go behind the grammar and lexicon, into the thought of that age, and try to discover what these phrases or statements meant as they passed from mouth to mouth or from book to book in those days? And then the difficult task of ascertaining what they meant on the lips of Jesus or in the writings of Paul! Can a phrase that was coined in the discussions of the schools, or in the fervid utterance of an apocalyptic writer, and, thence passing into popular use, at last found itself used by Jesus, bear the same interpretation as if it had been newly coined by him? This, at least, may be said: If the quantity of the supposed revealed truth in the New Testament writings be diminished by such investigations, the quality of what is left will only be the purer. Or may we not take a broader view, and see in all this restless thought of the apocalyptic writers the workings of the Spirit of God preparing the way for the teachings of the gospel of Christ? Answer such queries as we may, we are face to face with a new set of facts which must profoundly affect all future interpretation of the New Testament.

EDWARD E. NOURSE.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
Hartford, Conn.

#### NEW WORKS ON THE BOOK OF NUMBERS.

It is surely a singular event that three commentaries<sup>1</sup> on the book of Numbers should have appeared within one twelvemonth or less. This portion of the Old Testament has waited long among the English-speaking

<sup>1</sup> *The International Critical Commentary: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers.* By GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY. New York: Scribner. lii+489 pages. \$3, net.

*Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament.* Herausgegeben von KARL MARTI. Lieferung 19: *Numeri*. Erklärt von H. HÖLZINGER. Tübingen und Leipzig: Mohr (Siebeck), 1903. M. 3.75.

*Handkommentar zum Alten Testament.* Herausgegeben von W. NOWACK. I. Abteilung: *Die historischen Bücher.* 2. Band, 2. Teil: *Numeri*, übersetzt und erklärt, und *Einleitung zu Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri.* Von BRUNO BAENTSCH. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903. M. 5.80.

people for adequate treatment. In the possession of Dillmann the Germans have been far more fortunate. Apparently these are three independent commentaries. Neither Dr. Gray nor Dr. Holzinger mentions either of the others in his list of commentaries. Although Dr. Baentsch mentions the titles of the other two books, it seems impossible that he could have taken account of them in the body of his commentary. In his list of corrections and additions at the end of the volume he cites the work of Dr. Holzinger twice.

In his preface Dr. Gray makes suitable explanations and acknowledgments. The literature referred to is full and varied. The Introduction takes up the usual topics. "The connection with preceding and following books" shows a sense of an actual literary unity in the Pentateuch which is occasionally neglected under the influence of the analysis. The statement of the "Sources" follows the current analysis and that view of the date of the Jehovistic, Elohist, and priestly documents which seems to be in the way of becoming a tradition. The value of the book of Numbers is said not to be great from a strictly historical point of view, but to be great as showing the early and popular religious customs and beliefs under the monarchy in its earlier and later history. These views are not only summarized in the introduction, but the arguments for them are presented in the exegetical discussions where the text affords the evidence for them.

The commentary by Dr. Holzinger contains no translation, but this series of commentaries, while disclaiming necessary agreement in full with *Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* published under the editorship of Dr. E. Kautzsch, regards that as the translation to be accepted when not challenged in the commentary. In that work Numb. 10:29—13:1, and chaps. 21—24, were translated by Dr. Albert Socin, and the rest of the book by Dr. E. Kautzsch; and the volume bears the date of 1894—nine years earlier than the commentary. This volume contains xviii and 176 pages. The special feature of the introduction is a table giving the literary analysis of the book of Numbers. This might have been expected of the author of the *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, which Dr. Holzinger published ten years earlier.

In the body of the work the book of Numbers is divided into twenty-four sections, and several of these sections are further subdivided. At the head of each section or subsection are notes for textual criticism derived from Greek versions specifying MSS. or editions, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Syriac and Latin Vulgate versions, and the Targums. These notes are followed by a discussion of the analysis. The textual and literary notes are in fine print. The exegetical notes are in larger type and

are intended to be compact. Sometimes translations in Dr. Kautzsch's edition which are new are left to the lexicon for their justification. The fine-print matter is nearly or quite equal in amount to the exegetical matter in larger type.

The work of Dr. Baentsch contains pp. 443-702 of the volume of which it is a part, and the introduction, lxxxii pages. With this second part of the second volume the series is now complete. The general characteristics are those which the past ten years have made familiar to us, viz., a careful introduction, and a painstaking translation with a running commentary underneath it. In this running commentary all notes on the criticism of the text, on the meaning of words, on the structure of sentences, historical and all other illustrative matter, are fused together. In the other commentaries the complete treatment of a passage must often be looked for in two or more places. Each method has its advantages.

The introduction has a quite careful discussion of the three documents which contribute to Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. The contents of each document are given. The mode of thought, the tendency and unity of each, its representation of God, and its own type of legislation are presented in detail. The parts assigned to each document are indicated in the translation. This is the only one of the three commentaries which gives a list of corrections and additions. Each one has an index. Dr. Gray alone gives a Hebrew index.

A comparison of the treatment of the same passages in the three works is of value. שָׂחָם הָעֵץ (24:3, 15) is a phrase which occurs nowhere else. It is explained variously: (1) שָׂחָם הָעֵץ (or שָׂחָם הָעֵץ) "who sees truly," supported by the LXX (ὁ ἀληθινῶς ὁρῶν) and the Targum Onkelos. This is accepted in the two German commentaries. (2) שָׂחָם for סָחָם, "closed," supported by the Latin Vulgate. (3) שָׂחָם, "open," supported by the Syriac, Targums Jon. and Jerus., and accepted by Dr. Gray. The root is found nowhere else, and Semitic lexicography has not thus far seemed to offer a key to the meaning. Dr. Gray calls (1) unintelligible and unnatural, and says that (2) and (3) rest on very insecure philological foundations, and that (2) is over-subtle. He further objects to (1) because שָׂ "is not elsewhere found in these poems." Dr. Baentsch does not really give reasons, but translates *dessen Auge vollkommen(?) ist*. Dr. Holzinger apparently objects to (2) and (3) on the ground that emphasis upon the reality of the prophetic gift is to be looked for rather than emphasis upon the externalities. It does not aid us in seeking Dr. Holzinger's opinion to consult the translation of Dr. Socin, for he gives none in the text, and merely says "perhaps" (3) in a footnote, mentioning in addition the possibility of (2).

כֶּכֶד (24:17), a star "will march forth." If the text is correct, the figure is a bold one. This text and translation is accepted by Dr. Socin, and by Dr. Holzinger after him, who says that a correction "is perhaps not necessary, since the images, though not perfect, are sustained—the scepter which comes out of Israel." The LXX ἀνατελεί, supported by the Latin Vulgate and the Syriac, and perhaps Targum Onkelos, favors the presence in the text of some verb meaning "to rise," as the sun rises. They thus suggest the Hebrew כֶּכֶד as the true reading of the text. This reading is favored by Dr. Gray. Dr. Baentsch gives a yet third explanation. He quotes H. Winckler, who accepts a second root כֶּכֶד, meaning "shine, radiate," with which he associates the name Marduk. Accordingly, in his translation he renders: a star "will rise with splendor" out of Jacob.

These two instances seem to the present writer to exemplify some of the leading characteristics of the several commentaries, and, in fact, to reveal the mental attitude of each of the authors. If we could have three commentaries on all parts of the Old Testament as good as these, and each entirely independent of the others, the comparison of the three in their work and characteristics would yield knowledge of great value to the exegete and psychologist. Doubtless English-speaking students will use Gray's commentary for main work and the German commentaries, if they have them, for broadening their view. For this reason more detailed attention should be given to the work in English.

Dr. Gray's method can well be seen in his treatment of chaps. 22-24. Here, as in several other places in the volume, the preliminary treatment of a subject expands into a discussion as full as an article in the Bible dictionaries. These discussions are almost monographs. Dr. Gray begins by summarizing these three chapters. He then devotes four or five pages to the discussion of their literary composition, two pages to the date of their constituent elements, and about eight more pages to the personality of Balaam and the religious presuppositions of the story. He skilfully presents his evidence for the analysis, so far as it goes.

The most conspicuous evidence of compilation [in chap. 22] is as follows: (1) the doublet in 22:3a and 3b; (2) the irrelevance of vs. 4b after vs. 2; (3) the inconsistency of the two definitions of Balaam's home in vs. 5, one clause placing it on the Euphrates, the other in "the land of the children of Ammon" (so read with אֲמֹן); and (4) the parallelism and inconsistency of vss. 22-35 with much that precedes.

The greatest emphasis is laid upon the last point. Chaps. 23 and 24 are thought to be "not the work of a single writer." In the detailed analysis of these chapters, as elsewhere in the book, Dr. Gray appears to shrink

from those extremes which many analyses exhibit. His statement is neither so minute nor so positive as is frequently found. He is not dogmatic in his statement respecting the date of the Balaam narratives and poems. The narratives are assigned to J and E. The four poems in chaps. 23 and 24 are thought to belong to the earlier life of the monarchy, when the feeling of national strength and prosperity was at high tide. Dr. Gray decidedly declines to follow those who attribute avarice to Balaam on the ground of anything in these chapters. That weakness is attributed to Balaam in Deut. 23:5 f. (4 f.).

What historical basis is there for this section of the book? His answer (p. 315) is:

In the main the episode is a creation of the Hebrew national spirit in the days of national prosperity, and self-confidence sprung from reliance on the national God, Yahweh. It may, indeed, contain other historical features; such as the name of Balak, who may have been an actual king of Moab; but no means at present exist for distinguishing any further between the historical and legendary elements and those which are supplied by the creative faculty and the religious feeling of the writers.

The present writer remembers hearing a distinguished New Testament commentator described as "greater in excursus than in exegesis." This cannot be said of Dr. Gray, even though he excels in excursus. There are several other such valuable discussions, but none as long as that concerning Balaam. His exposition of the text is certainly on as high a level as his excurses. He maintains a careful and continuous examination of the text and of the evidence for it. For instance, in the analysis of these three chapters he presents the evidence respecting the use of the divine names, and he shows that the Massoretic text is not a reliable basis for exact analysis, so far as proper names are concerned. We wonder what the analysis might be if we could use the actual text of the Hexateuch current 400 B. C.

The amount of emendation proposed is probably less than the text needs. Many suggestions of Canon Cheyne are rejected. The sensible attitude maintained is exemplified in the notes on 24:10, 14. These brief notes are significant beyond their brevity. In the main, the evidence of the versions which is of importance is cited quite fully. The Latin Vulgate *stirpis*, for רבע (23:10), was surely worth noting. The citations from the versions in these three chapters are, we believe, accurately given, with one exception. On 24:14 by some oversight both LXX and Syr. are cited as testifying for למקרימי instead of the Massoretic לעמי. This is correct in regard to LXX. The Syriac, according to the editions of Walton's Polyglot, of Lee, and of Ooroomia, testifies to the reading לארצי. (Holzinger

notes both the Vulg. *stirpis* (23:10) and the Syr. ܐܝܠܝܢ (24:14). His method of giving the actual words of the versions is helpful in securing against the almost unavoidable oversights that are sure to occur once in a while.) One other error has been noted: p. 359, l. 7 from the bottom, "W. of the Dead Sea" should undoubtedly be "E. of the Dead Sea."

The treatment of these chapters is strong in lexicography. One instance will exemplify many. פָּאַרַח (24:17) was rendered in the A. V. (1611) text, "smite *the corners* of Moab," with a margin, "smite through *the princes* of Moab." This margin harmonizes with the translation of Luther and the marginal note of the Geneva version. The Variorum Bible gives "smite in pieces *both sides* of Moab." Dillmann (1886) gives it, "crush *the two temples* of Moab." Dr. Gray also translates, "and he smites through *the temples* of Moab." His justification of the translation is: "פָּאַרַח demands as its object, if not persons, at least parts of the person (*e. g.*, heads, loins). Hence the dual פָּאַרַח must be the two sides of the head, *i. e.*, the temples." Thus "Moab is personified (much as Israel is in Isa. 1:5b, 6) as a man smitten by his antagonist through his two temples."

Careful grammatical notes frequently meet the eye. Occasionally Ewald's and Davidson's *Syntax* are cited. Much more frequent are references to Driver's *Hebrew Tenses* and the Kautzsch edition of Gesenius. Most numerous, in these chapters, are the references to König's *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, mostly to Vol. III, which seems to be a favorite syntax, for it is cited sometimes, as 22:37, where a reference to the Gesenius-Kautzsch (1139) would answer as well.

Cursory examination of the entire volume gives reason to believe that the qualities found in the treatment of these three chapters are shown in equal degree everywhere in the book. It is not too much to say that the work is devoted to the complete—one feels at times, almost exhaustive—presentation of the results of a sound grammatico-historical exegesis. The author has levied freely on the available resources of the lexicography of the Semitic languages, of Hebrew grammar, of oriental archæology, of historical research, and of the current discussions of the religious development of Israel. The evidence is handled in a judicial temper and is well adapted to win the confidence of the student.

The work, as a whole, is one which, if thoroughly studied by a solitary student, could give him an adequate discipline in exegetical method as applied to narrative literature. It deserves a high rank among the other volumes of this series.

The views cited above respecting the historical value of chaps. 22-24

may well serve to call attention to the present unsatisfactory state of a large area in the Old Testament domain. It is doubtless true that it is no more unsatisfactory than the former condition of things. The heathen Balaam as a prophet of Jehovah, his prophetic consciousness, and the speaking ass taken as authentic history presented difficult problems. Now we are confronted with another and, at present, quite as difficult a problem, if these chapters have the kind of basis which is stated in the passage cited above.

We know that our Lord used parable and allegory with the utmost freedom in his teaching. In the Old Testament prophets we see that the Holy Spirit used the same freedom. It may be that the Holy Spirit used a larger freedom than was formerly supposed, in the writings which have come to us in the Old Testament. It was once incumbent upon the exegete to deal with the problems which these chapters presented, as if they were authentic history. It is now needful for the exegete to solve the problem presented by the later position. *What place has folklore, believed to be history, in the divine pedagogy?* Let us hope that this volume, while not answering the question which is so urgent to many minds, yet because it is the most worthy that English readers can use on this part of the Bible, may prove a valuable auxiliary in reaching the solution that is so much needed.

A question closely allied to this concerning the historical value of any part of the Hexateuch is that of the date of the documents. A post-exilic date for the priestly document has come to be assumed as proved. The phenomena of the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the theory of post-exilic production of P, and of the subsequent composition with J E D into the Hexateuch, present a problem which demands more serious treatment than the present writer has been able to find. Unless this problem has been solved, the post-exilic date of P is still open to question.

Without any doubt, the literary study of the Bible has come to stay. Thus far it is singularly one-sided, for it chiefly concerns one element of literary form—unity of a work. Relatively, style has been ignored in comparison with unity. Before we can gain balance in our study of the Bible, the style of the writings in the Bible, their clearness, force, and beauty, must be studied quite as much as the unity. Neither of the three commentaries under examination is a pioneer in this method of literary study. They do not absolutely ignore style, but pay some attention to it as a makeweight in the study of the unity of the work. The qualities of style have too much to do with the power of the Bible as a literature to be neglected after this fashion. Before the present movement in biblical



study has reached its legitimate culmination, the style of the biblical writings must be treated with as much fulness as is now given to literary analysis. It is just possible that this type of study, carried on as it should be, will temper the absurd extremes of literary analysis which are sometimes presented to the public.

The two German commentaries have their own excellences. The brevity of Dr. Holzinger has its advantage in not overloading the discussion. It has the disadvantage of leaving out subjects which one is anxious to find. This is the disadvantage which comes from the theory of the series of commentaries of which this is a part. The chief excellence seems to be the collection of material for textual criticism. The work of Dr. Baentsch is fuller, and more diverse from that of Dr. Gray; and it is therefore adapted to supplement the English commentary. The present writer is not sure that either of the two is as good as Dillmann's.

F. B. DENIO.

BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
Bangor, Me.

---

#### EUSEBIUS—CHURCH FATHER, HISTORIAN, AND APOLOGIST.

THE year 1903 has honored Eusebius with editions of two of his works, each in the first rank of importance or interest.<sup>1</sup> Schwartz's edition of the *Church History*, of which the text of the first five books has appeared, undoubtedly fills the long and strongly felt need for an adequate text; but critical examination of this must wait on the appearance of the *Prolegomena*.

Gifford's edition of the *Preparation for the Gospel* comes complete, text, translation, and notes—two stout volumes each of text and translation, and one of notes, some 2,700 pages in all, and gotten out in the best style of the Oxford University Press, in a convenient octavo size, neat cloth-binding, and admirable choice of type for the distinction between the text of Eusebius and the many excerpts from other works which form so large a part of the *Preparation* and are the characteristic element of the method of the work.

<sup>1</sup> *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae praeparationis libri XV*, ad codices manuscriptos denuo collatos recensuit, anglice nunc primum reddidit, notis et indicibus instruxit E. H. GIFFORD. Oxonii: E Typographeo Academico, 1903, 4 vols. in 5.

*Eusebius' Werke*. Zweiter Band. *Die Kirchengeschichte*. Bearbeitet im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften von EDUARD SCHWARTZ. Die lateinische Uebersetzung des Rufinus, bearbeitet im gleichen Auftrage von THEODOR MOMMSEN. Erste Hälfte. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903. 507 pages.